

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are requested.

Initially, it is noted that examiner requests that applicant file a certified copy of the 2004-041374 application as required by 35 U.S.C. §119(b). However, according to the Image File Wrapper available through PAIR, Form PCT/IB/304 “Notification Concerning Submission or Transmittal of Priority Document” according a priority date to the present application of February 18, 2004 was received at the USPTO on August 16, 2006. It is our understanding that this form satisfies the priority requirement under 35 U.S.C. §119(b).

The drawings have been amended to reflect that Figures 17-20 are prior art, as discussed in the Examiner Interview on May 20, 2009, and Figure 19 has been amended to clarify where the molten resin leaks in the prior art.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 1, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunehisa et al. (JP 2003-053779). This rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is patentable over Tsunehisa because claim 1 recites a two-sides in-mold decoration molding die including, in part, a second mold with a protruding section, protruded from a surface of a second decoration film non-passing region of the second cavity forming face, wherein when clamping the first mold and the second mold, an upper surface of the protruding section and a region of the first decoration film contact each other, so as to define, in the runner, a molten resin path for guiding the molten resin to pass between the first decoration film and the second decoration film preventing the molten resin from leaking.

One of the features of claim 1 is the protruding section that contacts the first decoration film and prevents the molten resin from leaking. The first and second decoration films overlap in the area over the cavities; therefore there is not a gap. However, where the two films do not

overlap in the second decoration film non-passing region, there would be a gap the width of the second decoration film between the first decoration film and the insert. This feature of claim 1 uses a protruding section to eliminate that gap and prevent leakage of the molten resin around the runner. Tsunehisa fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of the present invention.

Tsunehisa discloses a metal pattern configuration for the manufacture of a synthetic resin molded article and a pattern configuration where decalcomania is given to both sides. According to Figure 8, the two films 51,52 overlap and entirely cover the forming surface of the fixed mount 3 and the movable mount 4. The injection hole 3a (depicted as the sharp cone in Figure 8) lines up with the pore 51a in the films 51,52 and injects transparent resin between the films 51,52 to create a molded object as shown in Figures 9(a) – 9(e). The films cover the entire forming face of the mounts 3,4 and the injection hole 3a and pore 51a is located over the films 51,52. However, Tsunehisa does not disclose a second mold with a protruding section, protruded from a surface of a second decoration film non-passing region of the second cavity forming face, wherein when clamping the first mold and the second mold, an upper surface of the protruding section and a region of the first decoration film contact each other, so as to define, in the runner, a molten resin path for guiding the molten resin to pass between the first decoration film and the second decoration film preventing the molten resin from leaking. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Tsunehisa.

Independent claim 6 is patentable over Tsunehisa for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 6 recites disposing a second decoration film on the second mold such that the second decoration film does not overlap a protruding section, protruded from a surface of a second decoration film non-passing region of the second cavity forming face, and clamping the first mold and the second mold, such that an upper surface of the protruding section and a region of the first decoration film contact each other, so as to define, in the runner, a molten resin path for guiding the molten resin to pass between the first decoration film and the second decoration film, preventing the molten resin from leaking. Tsunehisa does not disclose or suggest this feature recited in independent claim 6. As a result, claim 6 is patentable over Tsunehisa.

Claim 5 is indirectly dependent on independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

Claims 2 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunehisa et al. (JP, 2003-053779) in view of Ishikawa (JP Pub. 08-025414). This rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Ishikawa is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing that the distortion of the metallic mold and breakthrough of molding material can be prevented when clamping force is applied by providing a depression having the same thickness of the film. However, it is apparent Ishikawa fails to disclose or suggest the feature lacking from Tsunehisa discussed above with regard to independent claim 1 and independent claim 6. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Tsunehisa and Ishikawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claim 1 and claim 6. Therefore, claims 2 and 7 are patentable over the combination of Tsunehisa and Ishikawa at least based on their dependency from independent claims 1 and 6, respectively.

Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunehisa et al. (JP 2003-053779) on view of Pratt et al. (US 5,662,946). This rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Pratt is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing that it is advantageous to have an adaptable mold base wherein die inserts, as well as components for transferring molten material into the actual molding chamber, can be removed and replaced from the adaptable mold base. However, it is apparent Pratt fails to disclose or suggest the feature lacking from Tsunehisa discussed above with regard to independent claim 1. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Tsunehisa and Pratt would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the feature recited in claim 1. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are patentable over the combination of Tsunehisa and Pratt at least based on their dependency from independent claim 1.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunehisa et al. (JP, 2003-053779) in view of Ishikawa (JP Pub. 08-025414) and further in view of Pratt et al. (US 5,662,946).

As discussed above, Tsunehisa, Ishikawa, and Pratt do not disclose or suggest the feature recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Tsunehisa, Ishikawa, and Pratt would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the feature recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is patentable over the combination of Tsunehisa, Ishikawa, and Pratt at least based on its indirect dependency from independent claim 1.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1-9 are allowable over the references relied upon in the rejection. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 1-9. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-9 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji HAMANO et al.

By: _____
/Allen N. Doyel/
2009.05.21 16:40:06 -04'00'

Allen N. Doyel
Registration No. 60,391
Agent for Applicants

AND/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 21, 2009